

<i>Interview Summary</i>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/821,860	CABRELE, FEDERICO	
Examiner	Art Unit		
Katherine W. Mitchell	3677		

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Katherine W. Mitchell.  
(2) Bernard Lippman.

(3) Somashokar  
(4) Keith Townsend (703) 535-  
2077

Date of Interview: 23 February 2007.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference  
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d)  Yes e)  No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) discussed: All

Identification of prior art discussed: Vernet & Fischer

Agreement with respect to the claims f)  was reached. g)  was not reached. h)  N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of reached, or any other comments: see *attached talking points*. . .

Lowe Hauptman & Berner, LLP

**Principal Patent Engineers,  
Intellectual Property Attorneys**

[www.infirm.com](http://www.infirm.com)

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments will be allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

Keith J. Townsend  
Patent Agent

1700 Diagonal Road, Suite 300  
Alexandria, Virginia USA 22314  
Phone: (703) 684-1111  
Fax: (703) 518-5499

direct: (703) 535-7077

[ktownsend@ipfirm.com](mailto:ktownsend@ipfirm.com)

Requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

feeth- examiner agrees to review Vernet to determine if it reaches against using the following materials other than metal or brick such that teeth would @ NOT grip in and ② reduce contact area; and plus have no reason to work or be added. Ex. with call by 2/27/07 <sup>with</sup> determination on this.

As to nomenclature 1st & 2nd may longitudinal slots ex believes it is just a label/name

**Examiner Note:** You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: see attached talking points.

Examiner reviewed Vernet after interview, and has determined that Vernet does not teach away from using the pin in softer materials, including drywall. Specifically, examiner notes col 2, lines 28-35, and also notes that Vernet col 1 lines 62 (Under SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION) 3 refers to US 4617692 as a similar pin. and that pin is expressly used in wallboard.

Docket No.: 713-1121

**PATENT****IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

In re Application of :  
Federico CABRELE : Confirmation No. 1818  
U.S. Patent Application No. 10/821,860 : Group Art Unit: 3677  
Filed: April 12, 2004 : Examiner: Katherine W Mitchell  
For: SCREW ANCHOR

Points for Discussion - interview scheduled for 1.30 pm Friday 02/23/2007

1. The final office action asserts (under §103) that Vernet contains disclosure that teaches the hypothetical person of ordinary skill that some of the slots 13 would be understood to be "main longitudinal slots" (MLS) while the remainder would be understood as being "secondary longitudinal slots" (SLS).

How does the hypothetical person of ordinary skill know which are which and why would any differentiation be made between what must be taken to be essentially identical slots? Under § 103 there must be a reason. §103 is different from §102 in that a purely arbitrary selection based on nothing more than a working knowledge of the claims (dubious even under §102), is definitely not permitted under §103. Teachings which would actually lead to this conclusion must be presented/identified.

2. Fischer discloses the use of teeth 5. The rejection purports that it would be obvious to add these to the Vernet arrangement because they would dig into the face of the rear wall once the Vernet arrangement was deformed to the condition shown in Fig. 4.

However, the deformed portion of Vernet is not within a bore as per Fischer and the more surface area of the deformed portion of Vernet which engages the rear wall of the "hollow brick 1" of Vernet, the more friction will be generated and the more resistance to rotation will be produced. The provision of teeth such as found in Fischer would very likely reduce the surface area even if plastically distorted and, because they would have to be made of the same pliable material as the remainder of the fastener, be totally incapable of digging into the brick. All that would probably result would be the reduction in the amount of surface area in engagement with the rear face of the brick 1 and a loss of frictional engagement.

Further, once distorted to the configuration shown in Fig. 4, the Vernet arrangement is not going to be pulled back out through the bore and any additional bits and pieces would be totally unnecessary. The addition of teeth to improve this would be pointless overkill.